



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 06-05

Paper No: __

RAY L. WEBER
RENNER, KENNER, GRIEVE, BOBAK
TAYLOR & WEBER
FIRST NATIONAL TOWER, FOURTH FLOOR
AKRON OH 44308-1456

COPY MAILED

JUL 05 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Blackson, et al. :
Application No. 09/780,737 : DECISION
Filing Date: 9 February, 2001 :
Attorney Docket No. KDS.P0001 :
:

This is a decision on the petition filed on 8 April, 2005, alleging, *inter alia*, unavoidable delay under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a), and unintentional delay under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

For the reasons set forth below, the petition:

- under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is **DISMISSED**; and
- under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**, and, as authorized, the petition fee (\$1,500.00) is charged to Deposit Account 18-0987.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the Examiner's final Office action mailed on 5 May, 2004, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 5 August, 2004;
- following an interview on 16 August, 2004, Petitioner filed on 20 August, 2004 (with a request and fee for extension of time), an amendment after final, which the Examiner

found was not a proper reply (in that it did not place the application *prima facie* in condition for allowance¹), and on 10 January, 2005;

- the application went abandoned after midnight 5 September, 2004;
- it appears that the Office did not mail a Notice of Abandonment before the instant petition was filed;
- accompanying the instant petition is a request for continued examination (RCE) with fee, and Petitioner has identified his amendment after final as his submission under the regulation;
- Petitioner alleges unavoidable delay, but makes no showing in support of the allegation;
- Petitioner alleges unintentional delay and makes the statement of unintentional delay.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).²

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.³

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.⁴ Where there is

¹ A proper reply is a an amendment *prima facie* placing the application in condition for allowance, a Notice of Appeal, or an RCE (with fee and submission). (See: MPEP §711.03(c).)

² 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

³ Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

⁴ See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁵ And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁶ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁷)

As to the Allegation
of Unavoidable Delay

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) are the petition and fee, a showing of unavoidable delay, a proper reply, and—where appropriate--a terminal disclaimer and fee.

Petitioner failed to satisfy the “showing” requirement under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).

As to the Allegation
of Unavoidable Delay

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) are the petition and fee, the statement of unintentional delay, a proper reply, and—where appropriate--a terminal disclaimer and fee.

Petitioner has satisfied the regulatory requirements under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

CONCLUSION

The instant petition:

- under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) hereby is dismissed; and
- under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) hereby is granted.

⁵. See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

⁶ See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

⁷ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

The fee for an extension of time (\$910.00), unnecessary herein and improvidently sought, is refunded.

The instant application is released to Technology Center 2600 for further processing in due course.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions